

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/725,005	05/05/97	PRIMM	F 09389/002001

ALAN D. ROSENTHAL  
ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P.  
700 LOUISIANA  
SUITE 4550  
HOUSTON TX 77002

PM51/0519

EXAMINER
----------

MAYO, T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3672	

05/19/99  
**DATE MAILED:**

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>08/925,506</b>	Applicant(s) <b>FRIMM et al.</b>
	Examiner <b>Tara L. Mayo</b>	Group Art Unit <b>3672</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tara L. Mayo

(3) Nikei Adiwuya

(2) Renee Alsandwor

(4) Johnathan Osha

Date of Interview 10 May 1999

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 2, and 11-14

Identification of prior art discussed:

O'Reilly et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,490,406); Schuller (U.S. Patent 3,391,666); and Lidén (U.S. Patent 4,498,412)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Examiner initiated contact with Applicants' representatives in an attempt to expedite prosecution of the instant application by canceling claims 1, 2, and 11 through 14. The Examiner also stated that she was amenable to amending claim 1 to include patentable subject matter. Applicants' representatives stated that they believed the claims were allowable as originally presented.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.